



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,992	06/09/2005	Hiroshi Matsui	081356-0243	1370
23428 7590 10/22/2008 FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			EXAMINER MARTIN, PAUL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1657	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/22/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>		<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
		10/537,992	MATSUI, HIROSHI
		<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
		PAUL C. MARTIN	1657

**All Participants:**

(1) PAUL C. MARTIN.

(2) Jon Weber.

**Date of Interview:** 16 October 2008

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Status of Application:** pending

(3) Yang Tang.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 1:30pm

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

112. 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph enablement rejection regarding the specificity and identity of the surfactants used in the method.

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Paul C Martin/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1657

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner had suggested amending the claims to more clearly delineate the difference between the two surfactants based upon tightening the HLB ranges described in the Specification. The problem the Examiner had was that the two surfactants are of the same class and are only distinguishable by their activities and HLB values, if the HLB values are 13 the difference between and HLB value of 13 and "less" than 13 cannot be practically differentiated. The Applicant's representative does not agree with the Examiner's position but agreed to entertain suggestions to be provided at a later date for possible claim amendments as long as the issue of New Matter was avoided.